

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 14, and 19 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-23 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-11, 14-16, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chino, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,334,687. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 1).

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 14, and 19.

Chino discloses a stand type screen apparatus for projecting an image on a screen using an image projection device that includes a base table, a projection device installing unit turnably mounted on the base table for detachably installing the image projection device, a support leg turnably mounted on the base table, and a screen holding unit holding the screen and turnably mounted on the support leg. The stand type screen apparatus can be folded by turning the screen holding unit with respect to the support leg and turning the leg portion and the projection device installing unit with respect to the base table, respectively. (Col. 1, lines 39-42).

When the apparatus is not used, the upper lid 150 is opened and the image projection device installing unit 300 is turned and placed on the bottom plate 110, whereby the image projection device 20 and the two speakers 30 and 40 disposed in the image projection device installing unit 300 can be accommodated in the accommodating unit of the base table 100. (Col. 4, lines 6-13). Clearly, in this position, the projector 20 is not in position for projection at the mirror 440. Therefore, Chino does not disclose the projector 20 being in position for projection at the mirror 440 when the projector 20 is concealed within the base table 100.

Furthermore, Figure 5 is an explanatory view showing a light passage of the light emitted from the image projection device 20. The light PL emitted from the image projection device 20 is reflected from the mirror 440 and forms an

image on the screen 540. (Col. 5, lines 1-5). In this position, the projector is not engaged within an opening of a housing and concealed within the housing. Therefore, Chino does not disclose the projector 20 being concealed within the accommodating unit of the base table 100 when the projector 20 is in position for projection at the mirror 440.

Additionally, in any position where the projector 20 could project onto a remote surface, instead of the mirror 440, the projector 20 is not concealed within the frame of the apparatus. Therefore, Chino does not disclose a position where the projector is engaged within the opening to conceal the projector within the housing for projection at the mirrored surface.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, includes the wording, "the rear projection screen and the housing are pivotal on the base for selectively ... engaging the projector within the opening to conceal the projector within the housing for projection at the mirrored surface". Applicants' independent claim 6, as amended, includes the wording, "means for selectively ... engaging the projector within the opening to conceal the projector within the housing for projection at the means for reflecting light". Chino does not disclose these limitations.

Additionally, Applicants' independent claim 14, as amended, includes the wording, "removing the housing from around a projector supported in a base of the display device so that the projector is exposed for projection onto a remote surface." Chino discloses the frame of the apparatus being removable from around the projector. However, when the frame is removed from around the projector, the projector is positioned for projection onto the mirror 440 and screen 540, not a remote surface. Therefore, Chino does not this limitation of Applicants' independent claim 14, as amended.

In addition, Applicants' independent claim 19, as amended, includes the wording, "concealing a projector ... within a housing ... and expanding a support structure for a mirrored surface within the housing so that the projector concealed within the housing is positioned for projection at the mirrored surface". Chino does not disclose this limitation.

Furthermore, Applicants' dependent claim 4 includes the wording, "the rear projection screen is detachable from the base". Applicants' dependent claim 10 includes the wording, "the rear projection screen is detachable from the housing". Chino discloses that the projector 1000 is composed of a screen device 10 on which an image projection device 20 and two speakers 30 and 40 are detachably installed. (Col. 3, lines 20-22). Therefore, Chino discloses only an image projection device 20 and speakers 30, 40 being detachable from a base. Chino does not disclose a projection screen being detachable from a base.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chino, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,334,687, in view of Okada, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,895,110. (Examiner's Action, page 4, ¶ 2).

In view of Applicants' arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 14, and 19 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.


No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan R. Dwyer
Howard G. Wong and
Robert M. Schneider

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 09/22/2005
(719) 260-7900